

genus-group names in limbo. If these six genus-group names are technically masculine, fixation of that gender in the larger sense will assure consistency and clarity.

Thus, while I can appreciate the sentiments behind Case 3335, I feel that the consistency of a uniform, strictly technical, masculine definition for the entire group of generic names and the two derived family-group names is the best way to go.

**Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic names *Gnorimus* Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville, 1828 and *Osmoderma* Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville, 1828 (Insecta, Coleoptera)**

(Case 3349; see BZN 63: 177–183)

(1) Robert E. Woodruff

*Emeritus Taxonomist, Florida State Collection of Arthropods, P.O. Box 147100,  
Gainesville, Florida 32605, U.S.A*  
(e-mail: BobsGems@aol.com)

I would like to go on record as supporting the proposal by Krell, Ballerio & Smith to conserve the names *Gnorimus* and *Osmoderma* (Coleoptera, SCARABAEIDAE). Resurrecting long forgotten or unused names is a great disservice to nomenclatural stability.

(2) Patrick Arnaud

*22 Sentier des Chèvres, 91250, Saintry / Seine, France*  
(e-mail: PatricNeotrop@aol.com)

I agree with the proposed conservation of *Gnorimus* and *Osmoderma* rather than the revalidation of long-unused names.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Celaenorrhinus ratna* Fruhstorfer, 1908 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)**

(Case 3339; see BZN 63: 114–117, 201–202)

Alexey L. Devyatkin

*Department of Entomology, Faculty of Biology, Moscow State University, 119992  
Moscow, Russia* (e-mail: ald@3.entomol.bio.msu.ru)

I can well understand my colleagues dealing with the Oriental HESPERIIDAE who are not happy to use the never used and forgotten specific name *Celaenorrhinus kawakamii* (Matsumura, 1907) instead of the well-established name *C. ratna* Fruhstorfer, 1908. The species in question seems to be widespread in the Oriental Region and, although described from Taiwan, forms a number of subspecies, described within the species *ratna*, on the continent. One of them, *C. ratna tyleri* Evans, 1926, was supposed (Devyatkin, 2000, p. 210) to be illustrated and listed in Osada et al. (1999, pl. 134, p. 221) from North Laos under the name *C. maculosus* (C. & R. Felder, [1867]) ssp. The species is therefore very likely to be found in Vietnam. While dealing